

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612 Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833

www.adstandards.com.au

CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number 114/98

2. Advertiser Sugar Australia Pty Ltd

3. Product Food4. Type of advertisement TV

5. Nature of complaint Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1

6. Date of determination Tuesday, 11 August 1998

7. DETERMINATION Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The Board viewed two advertisements.

- 1. The advertisement shows two men fishing from a boat. When tea is suggested, one discovers he does not have any sugar. After some discussion with his mate (who says he takes two sugars) they trade his biggest fish for a packet of sugar. When the recipient of the fish stows it away, his mate notices he in fact has a store of sugar packets. Knowing he's been caught out, the man with the fish looks challengingly unrepentant. At the end of the advertisement a voiceover says, 'Real Australians love real sugar.'
- 2. The advertisement shows a woman consulting a recipe book. It calls for sugar. She has none left. The advertisement then shows a man arriving home. As he is about to come inside she says, 'Sweetheart, before you take your boots off, could you pop next door and borrow a cup of sugar?' The advertisement then shows the man driving along an outback road, in the dying light, to get 'next door'. The advertisement ends with a voiceover saying, 'Real Australians love real sugar.'

THE COMPLAINT

Comments the complainant made about the advertisement included:

'(The advertisement) says "Real Australians love real sugar." There are people living in Australia to whom sugar is a deadly poison – about 300 000 diabetics. I am one and because I do not use sugar, I bitterly resent the implication that I am not a real Australian.'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board was of the opinion that this advertisement did not constitute discrimination or vilification and did not breach the Code. The Board dismissed the complaint.